



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,273	09/13/2000	Bradley Cain	120-194	8324
34845	7590	12/10/2008	EXAMINER	
Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP 33 NAGOG PARK ACTON, MA 01720			NGUYEN, THU HA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2453	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

handerson@smmalaw.com
officeadmin@smmalaw.com
cmorissette@smmalaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/661,273	CAIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THU HA T. NGUYEN	2453	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **1-55** are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 09/22/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

3. Applicant argues that Widegren does not teach whether or not a particular subscriber is authorized to receive particular data. In response to applicant's argument, the examiner submits that Widegren does teach the feature of a particular subscriber is authorized to receive particular data as shown in col. 11, line 33-col. 12, line 24, col. 13, line 52-col. 14, line 4, col. 15, line 30-col. 16, line 58 -*the policy control filtering data being pushed and pre-authorized before the client request by the policy server (i.e., distribution device) to gateway GPRS support node (GGSN) (i.e., access device) for authenticating client requested*).

4. Applicant argues that neither the information nor the described functions include distributing multicast group access control information is taught by Widegren.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

5. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55. Claims 2-14, 16-24, 26-34, 36-44 and 46-54 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in this office action below. Accordingly, claims 1-55 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-18, 20-21, 24-28, 30-31, 34-38, 40-41, 44-48, 50-51, and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Mittra** U.S. Patent No. **5,748,736**, in view of **Widegren et al.**, (hereinafter Widegren) U.S. Patent No. **6,621,793**.

8. As to claim 1, **Mittra** teaches the invention as claimed, including an access control method for an internet television system where each television channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a

particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel, the access control method comprising:

 distributing multicast group information from a distribution device to a plurality of access devices for use by the access devices in authenticating a subsequent requests by individual host device to join a television channel multicast group in order to reduce delay in authentication when a host device changes television channels, wherein each access device is logically closer to the host device from which the access device receives the request that the distribution device (abstract, col. 3, line 49-col. 4, line 19, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 36, col. 14, lines 1-19);

 receiving, by one of the access devices, a subsequent request by one of the host devices to join the television channel multicast group in order to change television channels (col. 13, lines 37-56);

 determining, by the access device, whether the host device is authorized to join the television channel multicast group, and receive a particular television channel, based upon the access control information distributed from the distribution device (col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56); and

 admitting, by the access device, the host device to the television channel multicast group if and only if the host device is determined to be authorized to join the television channel multicast group (abstract, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56);

 However, **Mittra** does not explicitly teach distributing access control information from a distribution device to a plurality of access devices for use by

the access devices in authenticating a subsequent requests by individual host device and whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether the host device is authorized to join the multicast group, thereby facilitating changing channels by reducing authentication delay.

Widegren teaches the feature of distributing access control information from a distribution device to a plurality of access devices for use by the access devices in authenticating a subsequent requests by individual host device and whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether the host device is authorized to join the multicast group, thereby facilitating changing channels by reducing authentication delay (col. 11, line 33-col. 12, line 24, col. 13, line 52-col. 14, line 4, col. 15, line 30-col. 16, line 58 -*the policy control filtering data being pushed and pre-authorized before the client request by the policy server (i.e., distribution device) to gateway GPRS support node (GGSN) (i.e., access device) for authenticating client requested*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Mittra and Widegren** to include the feature distributing access control information from a distribution device to a plurality of access devices for authenticating a subsequent requests by individual host device because it would have provided a better filtering and gating control of client request resource using policy mechanism.

9. As to claim 2, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein distributing the access control information from the distribution device to the access device comprises: pushing the access control information from the distribution device to the access control device using a predetermined push mechanism (col. 12, line 30-col.13, line 56).

10. As to claim 3, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the predetermined push mechanism comprises a reliable multicast mechanism (col.12, line 30-59).

11. As to claim 4, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein pushing the access control information from the distribution device to the access control device using the predetermined push mechanism comprises: joining a predetermined multicast group by the access device; sending the access control information to the predetermined multicast group by the distribution device using the reliable multicast receiving the access control information by the access device from the multicast group using the reliable multicast mechanism (col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56, col. 14, line 1-48).

12. As to claim 5, **Mittra** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the predetermined push mechanism comprises a policy service (abstract, col. 14, line 50-col. 15, line 4).

13. As to claim 7, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein pushing the access control information from the distribution device to the access control device using a predetermined push mechanism comprises: sending the access control information from the distribution device to the access device ().

14. As to claim 8, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the predetermined push mechanism comprises a management mechanism (abstract, col. 4, lines 38-44, col. 7, lines 26-44).

15. As to claim 11, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein pushing the access control information from the distribution device to the access control device using a predetermined push mechanism comprises: sending the access control information from the distribution device to the access device in the form of management information using the management mechanism (abstract, col. 4, lines 38-44, col. 7, lines 26-44).

16. As to claim 12, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein determining whether the host device is authorized to join the television channel multicast group comprises: authenticating the host device based upon the access control information (col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56).

17. As to claim 13, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein admitting the host device to the television channel multicast group comprises: joining the television channel multicast group by the access device using a predetermined multicast routing protocol (abstract, col. 4, lines 20-57).

18. As to claim 14, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the predetermined multicast routing protocol (col. 12, lines 30-59).

19. As to claim 15, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including an apparatus for distributing access control information in an internet television system whereby each television channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel, the apparatus comprising:

 maintenance logic and memory operably coupled to maintain multicast group access control information (abstract, col. 7, line 28-col. 9, line 35, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56); and

 distribution logic and an interface operably coupled to distribute information to at least one access device in order to reduce delay in authentication when a host device changes television channels, wherein the access device is operable to transmit the channel to the host device and is logically closer to the host device than the apparatus for distributing access

control information (abstract, col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 36, col. 14, lines 1-19),

whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether a host device is authorized to join a multicast group, and receive a particular television channel, and whereby access control information is moved closer to the host device, thereby facilitating changing channels by reducing authentication delay (col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56).

However, **Mittra** does not explicitly teach distributing access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication.

Widegren teaches the feature of distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication (col. 11, line 33-col. 12, line 24, col. 13, line 52-col. 14, line 4, col. 15, line 30-col. 16, line 58 -*the policy control filtering data being pushed and pre-authorized before the client request by the policy server (i.e., distribution device) to gateway GPRS support node (GGSN) (i.e., access device) for authenticating client requested*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Mittra and Widegren** to include the feature distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to

reduce delay in authentication because it would have provided a better filtering and gating control of client request resource using policy mechanism.

20. As to claim 25, **Mittra** teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program embedded in a tangible storage medium for controlling a computer system for delivering television where each channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel, the computer program comprising:

maintenance logic programmed to maintain multicast group access control information (abstract, col. 7, line 28-col. 9, line 35, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56); and

distribution logic programmed to distribute information to at least one access device in order to reduce delay in authentication when a host device changes television channels, wherein the access device is operable to transmit the channel to the host device and is logically closer to the host device than the apparatus for distributing access control information (abstract, col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 36, col. 14, lines 1-19),

whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed, and whereby access control information is moved closer to the host device, thereby facilitating changing channels by reducing authentication delay (col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56).

However, **Mittra** does not explicitly teach distributing access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication.

Widegren teaches the feature of distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication (col. 11, line 33-col. 12, line 24, col. 13, line 52-col. 14, line 4, col. 15, line 30-col. 16, line 58 -*the policy control filtering data being pushed and pre-authorized before the client request by the policy server (i.e., distribution device) to gateway GPRS support node (GGSN) (i.e., access device) for authenticating client requested*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Mittra** and **Widegren** to include the feature distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication because it would have provided a better filtering and gating control of client request resource using policy mechanism.

21. As to claim 35, **Mittra** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including an apparatus for providing receiver access control in an internet television system for delivering television where each channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel at a host device, the apparatus comprising:

distribution logic operably coupled to receive multicast group information from a distribution device in order to reduce delay in authentication when a host device changes television channels (abstract, col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 7, line 28-col. 9, line 35, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56);

host interface logic operably coupled to receive a request from a host device to join a television channel multicast group (figure 1-3, col. 13, lines 37-56); and

access control logic operably coupled to determine whether the host device is authorized to join the television channel multicast group based upon the access control information, wherein the apparatus is logically closer to the host device than the distribution device, and whereby access control information is moved closer to the host device, thereby facilitating changing channels by reducing authentication delay (figure 1-3, col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56).

However, **Mittra** does not explicitly teach distributing access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication.

Widegren teaches the feature of distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication (col. 11, line 33-col. 12, line 24, col. 13, line 52-col. 14, line 4, col. 15, line 30-col. 16, line 58 -*the policy control filtering data being pushed and pre-authorized before the client request by the policy server*

(i.e., distribution device) to gateway GPRS support node (GGSN) (i.e., access device) for authenticating client requested).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Mittra** and **Widegren** to include the feature distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication because it would have provided a better filtering and gating control of client request resource using policy mechanism.

22. As to claim 45, **Mittra** teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program embedded in a tangible storage medium for controlling a computer system where each channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel at a host device, the computer program comprising:

distribution logic programmed to receive multicast group information from a distribution device in order to reduce delay in authentication when a host device changes television channels (abstract, col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 7, line 28-col. 9, line 35, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56);

host interface logic programmed to receive a request from a host device to join a television channel multicast group (figure 1-3, col. 13, lines 37-56); and

access control logic programmed to determine whether the host device is authorized to join the television channel multicast group based upon the access control information, wherein the host interface logic is executed by a device that

is logically closer to the host device than the distribution device, and whereby access control information is moved closer to the host device, thereby facilitating changing channels by reducing authentication delay (figure 1-3, col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56).

However, **Mittra** does not explicitly teach distributing access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication and whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed.

Widegren teaches the feature of distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication and whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed (col. 11, line 33-col. 12, line 24, col. 13, line 52-col. 14, line 4, col. 15, line 30-col. 16, line 58 -*the policy control filtering data being pushed and pre-authorized before the client request by the policy server (i.e., distribution device) to gateway GPRS support node (GGSN) (i.e., access device) for authenticating client requested*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Mittra** and **Widegren** to include the feature distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication because it would have provided a better filtering and gating control of client request resource using policy mechanism.

23. As to claim 55, **Mittra** teaches the invention as claimed, including an internet television system for delivering a video signal to a host device for display, comprising:

a distribution device in communication with at least one access device over a communication network, wherein the distribution device distributes multicast group information to the at least one access device in order to reduce delay in authentication when a host device changes television channels (abstract, col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 7, line 28-col. 9, line 35, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56), and wherein the at least one access device uses the access control information to control access to at least one television channel multicast group, wherein the access device is logically closer to the host device than the distribution device, and whereby access control information is moved closer to the host device, thereby facilitating changing channels by reducing authentication delay (figure 1-3, col. 3, line 49-col. 4, col. 12, line 30-col. 13, line 56).

However, **Mittra** does not explicitly teach distributing access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication and whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed.

Widegren teaches the feature of distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication and whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed (col. 11, line 33-col. 12, line 24, col. 13, line 52-col. 14, line 4, col. 15, line 30-col. 16, line 58 -*the policy control*

filtering data being pushed and pre-authorized before the client request by the policy server (i.e., distribution device) to gateway GPRS support node (GGSN) (i.e., access device) for authenticating client requested).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Mittra and Widegren** to include the feature distribute the access control information to at least one access device using a predetermined push mechanism in order to reduce delay in authentication because it would have provided a better filtering and gating control of client request resource using policy mechanism.

24. As to claim 16-18, 20-21, 24, 26-28, 30-31, 34, 36-38, 40-41, 44, 46-48, 50-51, and 54, they are system and computer program claims directed to distributing access control information in an internet television of method claims 3-4, 8, and 10-11. Claims 16-18, 20-21, 24, 26-28, 30-31, 34, 36-38, 40-41, 44, 46-48, 50-51, and 54, and 54 have similar limitations to claims 3-4, 8, and 10-11; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

25. Claims 10, 23, 33, 43 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Mittra** U.S. Patent No. **5,748,736**, in view of **Widegren et al.**, (hereinafter Widegren) U.S. Patent No. **6,621,793**, further in view of **Garrity et al.**, (hereinafter Garrity) U.S. Patent No. **6,230,205**.

26. As to claim 10, **Mittra-Widegren** does not explicitly teach Command Line Interface (CLI). However, **Garrity** teaches wherein the management mechanism comprises a Command Line Interface (CLI) (figure 7, col. 4, lines 33-58, col. 10 lines 29-col. 11, line 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Mittra-Widegren and Garrity** to include Command Line Interface because it would provide an improved system for managing transfer of data within a communications system.

27. As to claims 23, 33, 43 and 53, they are system and computer program claims directed to distributing access control information in an internet television of method claim 10. Claims 23, 33, 43 and 53 have similar limitations to claim 10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

28. Claims 6, 9, 19, 22, 29, 32, 39, 42, 49 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Mittra** U.S. Patent No. **5,748,736**, in view of **Widegren et al.**, (hereinafter Widegren) U.S. Patent No. **6,621,793**, further in view of **Dobbins et al.**, (hereinafter Dobbins) U.S. Publication No. **US 2002/0066033**.

29. As to claim 6, **Mittra-Widegren** do not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Dobbins** teaches wherein the policy service comprises a Common Open Policy Service (COPS) (abstract, paragraph 0021). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Mittra-Widegren and Dobbins** to include a Common Open Policy service because it would have an efficient communications system that can manage and distribute content resources to users based on user's profile or, in other words, based on access control information by using policy service rule.

30. As to claim 9, **Mittra-Widegren** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Dobbins** teaches wherein the management mechanism comprises a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) (figures 1, 11, paragraphs 0009-0010, 0020-0021, 0173). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of **Mittra-Widegren and Dobbins** to have a SNMP in the management mechanism because it would have an efficient network management to managing complex network and content resources.

31. As to claim 19, 22, 29, 32, 39, 42, 49 and 52, they are system and computer program claims directed to distributing access control information in an internet television of method claims 6 and 9. Claims 19, 22, 29, 32, 39, 42, 49, and 52 have similar limitations to claims 6 and 9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

32. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

33.

34. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3989. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

35. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne, can be reached at (571) 272-4001.

36. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

37. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications.

38. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/THUHA T. NGUYEN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2153

December 07, 2008

